

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION

FILED

JAN 03 2025

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT  
BY DEPUTY

In re:  
TEXAS REIT, LLC  
DEBTOR.

CASE NO. 24-10120-smr

CHAPTER 11

**AMENDED MOTION TO ENFORCE AUTOMATIC STAY**

To the Honorable Court:

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C 362(a) and 105(a), Ali Choudhri files this Motion to Enforce Automatic Stay in bankruptcy matter 24-10120-smr and would respectfully show as follows:

**Background**

Over the past 12 years, Osama Abdullatif, Omar Khawaja, Ali Mokaram, and George Lee (collectively, the “Judgment Creditors”) in this matter have employed various litigation tactics to gain access to the assets of Ali Choudhri in an effort to collect on state court judgements they claim they are owed. In furtherance of this organized plan of attack, Judgment Creditors have lodged claims of alter ego against Mr. Choudhri and the debtor in an effort to subvert the bankruptcy process and gain impermissible access to assets of the bankruptcy estate in violation of 11 U.S.C. 362(a)(1) and (3). *See Exhibit 1, Excerpt from Omar Khawaja’s Deposition dated September 11, 2024, pg. 201 ln. 7-10, 12-25;*

7 Q. Do you contend 1001, the property, 1001, or  
8 the entity that owns 1001, is an alter ego of Ali  
9 Choudhri or Texas REIT?  
10 A. Yes. Yes, it is.

12 A. Even if it's not listed by -- even if it's not  
13 here, it is -- (anything that you control or own is an)  
14 alter ego, because that's how you operate.

15 Q. Okay. Do you know who BridgeCo is,

16 Mr. Khawaja?

17 A. Yes.

18 MR. BALLASES: Objection. Form.)

19 Q. (BY MR. CHOUDHRI) Have you spoken to anybody  
20 at BridgeCo?

21 A. No.

22 MR. BALLASES: Objection. Form.)

23 Q. (BY MR. CHOUDHRI) But you've sued BridgeCo;  
24 correct?

25 A. Yes.

In light of this testimony and the continued attacks against Mr. Choudhri and his related entities during the pendency of this bankruptcy matter, it does not appear that Judgment Creditors will cease in their collection efforts absent court intervention. Therefore, an extension of the automatic stay to cover Mr. Choudhri and his related entities is necessary to protect the assets of the bankruptcy estate from any creditors seeking to impermissibly "step to the front of the line." Indeed, the Honorable Judge Marvin Isgur in the Southern District of Texas has essentially reached the same conclusion about the nature of any alter ego proceeding against Mr. Choudhri and his related entities while this matter is pending bankruptcy, *See Exhibit 2, Excerpt from Motion Hearing on November 13, 2024, pg. 30, ln. 2-15:*

2           The adversary proceeding that I've been handed up,  
3 and again, this is all preliminary, 24-10 — 120 is the case  
4 number. The adversary proceeding is 24-1039, seeks to hold in  
5 the Bankruptcy Court Texas REIT, which is the Debtor in the  
6 Bankruptcy Court, liable for Mr. Choudhri's personal debts.

7           If Mr. Choudhri is, in fact, liable, as is being  
8 alleged in this adversary proceeding, for Texas, excuse me,  
9 liable — if Texas REIT is liable for Mr. Choudhri's debts,  
10 then a liquidation, or a collection, I should say, of — from  
11 Mr. Choudhri of the debts, will diminish his available funds to  
12 pay other creditors.

13           And you don't get to step to the front of the line.  
14 The automatic stay applies. If the automatic stay applies, you  
15 can't proceed in State Court. And maybe there's some other

Accordingly, this Court should follow Judge Isgur's reasoning and hold that the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. 362(a) should apply to Ali Choudhri and his related entities while this matter is pending bankruptcy in order to prevent creditors from colluding to impermissibly gain access to assets of the bankruptcy estate. *See Exhibit 3, Original Petition of George Lee alleging alter ego against Ali Choudhri and related entities, Case No. 24-10120-smr.* To do otherwise would thwart the purpose of the automatic stay and the bankruptcy process generally – to ensure the fair and efficient reorganization of a distressed entity.

## Argument

While the automatic stay of section 362(a) is far-reaching and applies to almost any type of action against the debtor or the property of the estate, it does not extend to “non-debtors or even co-debtors, co-tortfeasors, or co-defendants.” *In re Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.*, 35 S.W.3d 602, 604 (Tex.2000) (orig.proceeding); *see Cortland Line Co., Inc. v. Israel*, 874 S.W.2d 178, 180-81 (Tex.App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1994, writ denied) (automatic stay did not protect debtor corporation's officers who were sued in their individual capacities).

Section 362(a)(1) of the bankruptcy code provides an exception to this rule when the assets of the bankruptcy estate would be jeopardized through the continuation of the action. *Bamburg v. Townsend*, 35 S.W.3d 85, 89 (Tex.App.-Texarkana 2000, no pet.). However, to be entitled to this exemption, the principal is required to demonstrate either (1) an identity between the debtor and principal such that the debtor could be said to be the true defendant and a judgment against the principal would in effect be a judgment or finding against the debtor; or (2) extending the stay against the principal would contribute to the debtor's efforts of rehabilitation. *See Novosad v. Cunningham*, 38 S.W.3d 767, 770 (Tex.App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 2001, no pet.); *Bamburg*, 35 S.W.3d at 89. Both elements are satisfied here, thus warranting extension of the stay to a non-debtor.

The Judgment Creditors have raised the claim of alter ego against both Ali Choudhri and the debtor. Any successful claim of alter ego against one would necessarily implicate the rights of the other such that a judgment against one would in effect be a judgment or finding against the other thereby jeopardizing assets of the bankruptcy estate. Moreover, extending the stay against the principal, Mr. Choudhri, would contribute to the debtor's efforts at rehabilitation. Protecting Ali Choudhri from claims of alter ego would ensure funds are protected in the bankruptcy estate

to pay creditors upon any subsequent finding of alter ego by a court of competent jurisdiction.

While Mr. Choudhri is under the belief that the alter ego claims are without merit, courts have held that such claims are putative property of the bankruptcy estate during the pendency of any bankruptcy proceeding and therefore are protected under section 362(a). *See Matter of S.I. Acquisition, Inc.*, 817 F.2d 1142, 1150-51 (5th Cir. 1987).

Additionally, the Seventh Circuit has held that the automatic stay can be extended to non-debtors when the continued prosecution of a claim against the non-debtor will have an “immediate-adverse economic consequence for the debtor’s estate.” *Queenie, Ltd v. Nygard Int’l*, 321 F.3d 282, 287-88 (2d. Cir. 2003). Adverse economic consequences for the debtor can exist where a claim against a non-debtor threatens a debtor’s reorganization. *See In re Hal Luftig Co.*, No. 22-01176, 2023 Bankr. LEXIS 19, at \*1 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Jan. 5, 2023). In *Hal Luftig Company, Inc.*, the bankruptcy court extended the corporate debtor’s stay to its sole shareholder, Mr. Luftig, who was jointly and severally liable with the corporate debtor on a judgment. *Id.* at \*10. The bankruptcy court found it relevant that Mr. Luftig, as president and sole shareholder, was one of three employees of the debtor, and that the debtor was dependent on Mr. Luftig’s promotional efforts and investments to generate revenue. Thus, if the judgment creditor was permitted to enforce its judgment against Mr. Luftig during the bankruptcy, Mr. Luftig would have to reduce his efforts for the debtor, threatening its ability to repay its creditors and jeopardizing any reorganization efforts. The bankruptcy court, in accord with the Fourth Circuit, recognized that this was an “unusual circumstance” warranting the extension of the stay to the non-debtor. *Id.*

The automatic stay should be extended to Ali Choudhri, a non-debtor, because the continued prosecution of the alter ego claim against Mr. Choudhri will have an “immediate-

adverse economic consequence for the debtor’s estate.” Specifically, the claim against Mr. Choudhri at issue threatens the debtor’s reorganization efforts. Mr. Choudhri and the debtor are subject to state court judgments held by Judgment Creditors for which they are jointly and severally liable, and any collection efforts brought against Mr. Choudhri threatens the viability of the bankruptcy estate. *See Exhibit 4, Petition for Review filed with the Texas Supreme Court on behalf of Texas REIT, LLC dated December 14, 2023; see Exhibit 5, Supreme Court Request for Response due on February 26, 2024; and see Exhibit 6, Notice of Bankruptcy filed with the Texas Supreme Court on behalf of Texas REIT, LLC by Attorneys for Respondents dated February 9, 2024* (essentially counsel for Judgment Creditors are claiming that they would like the benefits of bankruptcy protection while still pursuing their claims against the debtor in a state court forum). As in *Luftig*, Mr. Choudhri is also the principal of the debtor, and the debtor is dependent on Mr. Choudhri’s promotional efforts and investments to generate revenue. Thus, if Judgment Creditors were permitted to enforce their judgments against Mr. Choudhri during the bankruptcy, Mr. Choudhri would have to reduce his efforts for the debtor, threatening its ability to repay its creditors and jeopardizing any reorganization. Accordingly, the Court should recognize that an “unusual circumstance” exists thus warranting the extension of the stay to a non-debtor.

Furthermore, raising alter-ego allegations triggers the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(3), halting any legal action against Mr. Choudhri and the entities and individuals alleged to be his alter egos and those of the Debtor in this case. Indeed, at a minimum, the stay must halt the claims of alter ego that the Judgment Creditors have raised in this case. And even if the automatic stay did not apply to those entities, and those claims, the Court should exercise its power to stay them anyway under 11 U.S.C. § 105(a).

**I. All of the claims against Choudhri and his alleged alter egos are subject to the automatic stay under section 362(a)(3).**

The first consequence that results from Judgment Creditor's alter ego allegations is to make the claims against all the alleged alter egos subject to the automatic stay under section 362(a)(3). The doctrine of alter ego "is one distinct method of piercing the corporate veil." *In re S.I. Acquisition, Inc.*, 817 F.2d 1142 (5th Cir. 1987) (citing *Castleberry v. Branscum*, 721 S.W.2d 270, 272 (Tex.1986)). Alter ego applies when "there is such unity between corporation and individual" (or such unity between one corporation and another) "that the separate identity of the corporation has ceased, and holding only the corporation liable would result in injustice." *Riquelme Valdes v. Leisure Resource Group, Inc.*, 810 F.2d 1345 (5th Cir. 1987) (quoting *Castleberry*, 721 S.W.2d at 272). And as a consequence of the doctrine's application, the "assets and liabilities" of one entity become the "assets and liabilities" of the other. *State v. DeSantino*, 899 S.W.2d 787, 790 (Tex. App. 1995).

Accordingly, where, as here, numerous entities and individuals are alleged to be alter egos of a bankrupt debtor, that makes the assets and liabilities of the alter egos the assets and liabilities of the estate. *See Pisculli v. T.S. Haulers, Inc.*, 426 B.R. 52, 60 (E.D.N.Y. 2010) ("[A] court may pierce the corporate veil of a business and treat its assets as the debtor's individual property, and, thus, property of the debtor's estate[] under an alter ego theory.").

That means any claim to recover from one of the alter egos is subject to the automatic stay. After all, the automatic stay prohibits not only claims against the debtor itself under section 362(a)(1), but also prohibits any "act" to "obtain possession of property of the estate" under section 362(a)(3). For that reason, numerous cases have held that a non-frivolous allegation of alter ego makes the alleged alter egos subject to the automatic stay. *See, e.g., In re Adler*, 494 B.R. 43, 53 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2013) (holding that claims against alleged alter egos were subject

to the automatic stay because the debtor and its alter egos “were at all relevant times one and the same entity”); *Sky Cable, LLC v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 23 F.4th 313 (4th Cir. 2022) (noting that bankruptcy court had denied a motion for postjudgment attorneys’ fees against debtor “and his alter egos because such an award was precluded by the bankruptcy court’s automatic stay”).<sup>1</sup> This Court should follow these other courts’ lead and hold that all claims against all individuals and entities that are alleged to be alter egos of Ali Choudhri and the debtor in bankruptcy are subject to the automatic stay.

**II. At a minimum, the claims alleging alter ego liability must be subject to the automatic stay.**

Even if all of the claims against the alleged alter egos of Choudhri and the debtor were not subject to the automatic stay, at a minimum, the alter ego claims themselves must be subject to the stay. *See Matter of S.I. Acquisition, Inc.*, 817 F.2d 1142, 1150-51 (5th Cir. 1987) (holding that causes of action “premised solely upon” alter ego liability are “automatically stayed as to all parties involved” by section 362(a)(1) or (3) upon the filing of the debtor’s bankruptcy petition). This is because the “alter ego claims” *themselves* are “property of the estate.” *Steyr-Daimler-Puch of America Corp. v. Pappas*, 852 F.2d 132, 135 (4th Cir. 1988) (holding that “the automatic stay applies” to alter ego claims because an alter ego claim is property of the estate). Indeed, alter ego claims belong *exclusively* to the estate, so only “the trustee or debtor-in-possession has exclusive standing to assert the claim.” *Raytheon Co. v. Boccard USA Corp.*, 369 S.W.3d 626, 638 (Tex. App. 2012). And that means the Judgment Creditors must be prohibited from raising

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the only cases that have held that alter egos *were not* subject to the automatic stay analyzed only whether the alter egos were actually “the debtor” under section 362(a)(1), rather than asking whether claims against the alter egos fell under section 362(a)(3) because they sought “property of the estate.” *See, e.g., In re Meyerland Co.*, 82 B.R. 831 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 1988); *Pavers & Road Builders Dist. Council Welfare Fund v Core Contracting of N.Y., LLC*, 536 BR 48, 51 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2015). The analysis of these cases is incomplete and therefore unpersuasive.

any claim against Mr. Choudhri and his related entities that is in any way dependent upon proving liability through an alter ego theory.

**III. Even if the claims against the alter egos were not subject to the automatic stay, the Court should extend the stay to them under section 105(a).**

Yet even if the claims against the Debtor's alter egos were not subject to the automatic stay, the Court should extend the stay to reach them under section 105(a). Even when claims against non-debtors are not subject to the automatic stay, the court can extend the stay to encompass them "where proceeding with the claim of the co-defendants would work an injustice or adversely affect the bankrupt estate." *In re Precision Colors, Inc.*, 36 B.R. 429, 431 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1984); *In re Johns-Manville Corp.*, 33 B.R. 254, 263-64 (Bankr.S.D.N.Y.1983). And allowing claims against the alleged alter egos in this case could have just such an adverse effect on the bankrupt estate, because if Judgment Creditors are right, any judgments collected from these entities would ultimately drain assets from the estate. For just this reason, courts routinely extend the stay to parties who are alleged to be alter egos of the debtor, because allowing those claims to proceed to judgment would risk draining the estate of funds. *E.g., S.I. Acquisition, Inc. v. Eastway Delivery Serv. (In re S.I. Acquisition, Inc.)*, 817 F.2d 1142, 1147 (5th Cir.1987); *In re Kuecker Equip. Co.*, 338 B.R. 52, 60–61 (Bankr.W.D.Mo.2006); *Ng v. Adler (In re Adler)*, 494 B.R. 43 (Bankr. E.D. N.Y. 2013); *Greenberg v. Fincher & Son Real Estate, Inc.*, 753 S.W.2d 506, 507 (Tex. App. 1988); *In re Excel Innovations, Inc.*, 502 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2007); *Cocoletzi v. Fat Sal's Corp.*, No. 15-02696, 2015 WL 4655164, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 5, 2015).

### **Conclusion**

For these reasons, Ali Choudhri's Motion to Enforce the Automatic Stay to matters involving the alter ego claims against Mr. Choudhri and the Debtor should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,  
  
By: /s/ Ali Choudhri  
Ali Choudhri  
1001 West Loop, Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77027  
Phone: 281-630-6627  
Email: ali@jetallcapital.com  
Defendant, *Pro se*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Motion was served by first class mail, postage prepaid, properly addressed and/or by electronic means for all Pacer system participants, on January 3, 2024, to all parties listed on the attached service list.

  
/s/ Ali Choudhri  
Ali Choudhri

Label Matrix for local noticing  
0542-1  
Case 24-10120-smr  
Western District of Texas  
Austin  
Tue Dec 31 14:11:34 CST 2024

AGAPE  
6161 Savoy Drive Suite 500  
Houston, TX 77036-3326

Texas REIT, LLC  
2450 Wickerham Lane, Suite 202  
Austin, TX 78741-4744

Affordable Dumpster Rentals  
6520 US Hwy 301 S Suite 112  
Riverview, FL 33578-4324

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT  
903 SAN JACINTO, SUITE 322  
AUSTIN, TX 78701-2450

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
1111 Louisiana Street, 44th Floor  
Houston, TX 77002-5225

Ali Choudhri  
2425 West Loop St 11 FL  
Houston TX 77027

Amina Properties, L.L.C.  
c/o T. Josh Judd  
Andrews Myers, P.C.  
1885 Saint James Place, 15th Floor  
Houston, Texas 77056-4175

Caz Creek Holdings 2, LLC  
c/o Howard Marc Spector  
12770 Coit Rd, Ste 850  
Dallas, TX 75251

Caz Creek Holdings 2, LLC as Custodian for  
CCH TX2, LLC  
14800 Landmark Blvd., Suite 400  
Dallas, TX 75254-7598

Caz Creek Lending  
118 Vintage Park Blvd No. W  
Houston, TX 77070-4095

City of Houston  
c/o Tara L. Grundemeier  
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson LLP  
PO Box 3064  
Houston, TX 77253-3064

Clark Hill PC  
500 Woodward Ave Suite 3500  
Detroit, MI 48226-3485

Competition Roofing, Inc.  
7310 Fairview Street  
Houston, TX 77041-2106

Cypress BridgeCo, LLC and Magnolia BridgeCo  
c/o McDowell Hetherington LLP  
ATTN: Robert P. Debelak III  
1001 Fannin St., Ste. 2400  
Houston, TX 77002-6706

Cypress BridgeCo, LLC and Magnolia BridgeCo,  
c/o McDowell Hetherington LLP  
ATTN: Matthew W. Bourda  
1001 Fannin St., Ste. 2400  
Houston, TX 77002-6706

Dalio Holdings I, LLC  
2425 West Loop South Suite 77027-4210

Dalio Holdings I, LLC  
c/o Willian Choslovsky  
300 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 2750  
Chicago, IL 60606-6782

Dalio Holdings II, LLC  
c/o Willian Choslovsky  
300 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 2750  
Chicago, IL 60606-6782

Drew Dennett  
2450 Wickerham Lane, Suite 202  
Austin, TX 78741-4744

FGMS Holdings, LLC  
12000 Network Blvd., Bldg. B Suite 210  
San Antonio, TX 78249-3353

(p)HARRIS COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
P O BOX 2848  
HOUSTON TX 77252-2848

Houston Community College System  
c/o Tara L. Grundemeier  
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson LLP  
PO Box 3064  
Houston, TX 77253-3064

Houston ISD  
P.O. Box 4668  
Houston, TX 77210-4668

Houston ISD  
c/o Tara L. Grundemeier  
Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson LLP  
PO Box 3064  
Houston, TX 77253-3064

IPFS Corporation  
30 Montgomery Street, Suite 501  
Jersey City, NJ 07302-3821

IPFS Corporation  
PO Box 412086  
Kansas City, MO 64141-2086

JLM Law, PLLC  
1001 West Loop South  
Ste 700  
Houston, TX 77027-9033

Jetall Companies, Inc.  
2425 West Loop South Suite 1100  
Houston, TX 77027-4210

John Quinlan  
c/o Steven A. Leyh  
Hoover Slovacek, LLP  
5051 Westheimer, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77056-5839

John Quinlan, Omar Khawaja, and Osama Abdullatif  
c/o Steve Leyh Hoover Slovacek LLP  
Galleria Tower 2, 5051 Westheimer, Ste 1  
Houston, Texas 77056  
Houston, TX 77056-5622

Mack Brooks, LLC as agent for  
FGMS Holdings, LLC  
12672 Silicon Drive, Suite 150  
San Antonio, TX 78249-3450

Offices of Drew Dennett  
2450 Wickersham Ln  
Suite 202  
Austin, TX 78741-4744

Steadfast 829 Holdings, Inc.  
c/o Rodney Drinnon  
McCathern  
2000 West Loop South Suite 1850  
Houston, TX 77027-3744

United States Trustee - AUL2  
United States Trustee  
903 San Jacinto Blvd, Suite 230  
Austin, TX 78701-2450

WCW Houston Properties, LLC  
Howley Law PLLC c/o Eric Terry  
711 Louisiana Street, Ste 1850  
Houston, TX 77002-2790

Wrinkle, Gardner & Company, PC  
PO Box 1707  
Friendswood, TX 77549-1707

Stephen W. Sather  
Barron & Newburger, PC  
7320 N MoPac Expy, Suite 400  
Austin, TX 78731-2347

Johnson & Starr, Agent for  
Tax Lien Loan SPV LLC  
c/o Howard Marc Spector  
12770 Coit Rd #850  
Dallas TX 75251-1364

Mark C. Taylor, Special Litigation Counsel  
Holland & Knight LLP  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1800  
Austin, Texas 78701-4042

Omar Khawaja  
c/o Steven A. Leyh  
Hoover Slovacek, LLP  
5051 Westheimer, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77056-5839

Tax Lien Loan SPV LLC  
c/o Johnson & Starr  
PO Box 28040  
Austin TX 78755-8040

WCW HOUSTON PROPERTIES, LLC  
Attn: Judith Chang - CFO  
3657 Briarpark Drive, Ste. 188  
Houston, TX 77042-5267

WCW Houston Properties, LLC  
c/o M. Kevin Powers  
Burford Perry, LLP  
909 Fannin, Suite 2630  
Houston, Texas 77010-1003

c/o Steven A. Leyh  
Hoover Slovacek, LLP  
5051 Westheimer, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77056-5839

Mack Brooks, LLC as agent and  
attorney in fact for FGMS Holdings, LLC  
c/o Howard Marc Spector  
12770 Coit Rd, St 850  
Dallas, TX 75251

Nationwide Security  
2425 W Loop S Ste.300  
Houston, TX 77027-4207

Osama Abdullatif  
c/o Steven A. Leyh  
Hoover Slovacek, LLP  
5051 Westheimer, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77056-5839

US Insurance Funding  
8303 SW Freeway Suite 435  
Houston, TX 77074-1691

WCW Houston Properties, LLC  
Attn: Tami Kim Broker Associate/Attorne  
6100 Corporate Drive, Suite 319  
Houston, TX 77036-3433

WCW Houston Properties, LLC  
c/o Matthew Kevin Powers  
Burford Perry  
909 Fannin, Suite 2630  
Houston, TX 77010-1003

Mark Curtis Taylor  
Holland & Knight  
100 Congress Ave  
Suite 1800  
Austin, TX 78701-4042

The preferred mailing address (p) above has been substituted for the following entity/entities as so specified by said entity/entities in a Notice of Address filed pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 342(f) and Fed.R.Bank.P. 2002 (g)(4).

Harris County Tax Assessor  
Po Box 4622  
Houston, TX 77210-4622

(d) Harris County, et al  
P.O. Box 2848  
Houston, TX 77252

(d) Harris County, et al.  
P.O. Box 2848  
Houston, TX 77252

The following recipients may be/have been bypassed for notice due to an undeliverable (u) or duplicate (d) address.

(d) FGMS Holdings, LLC  
12000 Network Blvd., Bldg. B Suite 210  
San Antonio, TX 78249-3353

	End of Label Matrix
Mailable recipients	51
Bypassed recipients	1
Total	52